

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action mailed August 9, 2005. Claims 1 – 49 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 21, and 40 are in independent form and are being amended. No new matter is added by these amendments.

A Petition for a Three Month Extension of Time to respond to the Office Action is submitted herewith. A check in the amount of \$510 is submitted herewith to cover the cost of the three-month extension. Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for any insufficiency of payment or credit for any overpayment.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 - 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,567,772 (“*Hoeft*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,811,243 (“*Racine*”). The Office Action rejected claims 40 - 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,808,905 (“*Normann*”) in view of *Racine*.

All of the claims as presently presented overcome these references alone and in combination. Specifically, each claim now recites “if the decoded command is an appropriate command for a current context of the drawing routine”. For example, if the user is trying to make a swing joint connection between two pipes using the “swing joint” voice command when the number of swing joints currently selected is not equal to two, the system may determine that the “swing joint” command is not appropriate for this context, and an error message may be displayed. Support for this amendment may be found in the last paragraph on page 12 of the specification.

Hoeft, *Racine*, and *Normann* (alone or in combination) do not teach this feature. *Hoeft* and *Normann* merely discuss CAD systems without any voice recognition, let alone context sensitive voice recognition. In addition, *Racine* fails to teach context sensitive voice recognition. Accordingly, all pending claims are novel, non-obvious and patentably distinguished over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Peter Zura

Reg. No. 48,196

Customer No. 24573

Dated: February 9, 2006